

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

February 27, 2014

The Board of Education and the Board of Career and Technical Education met at the James Monroe State Office Building, Jefferson Conference Room, 22nd Floor, Richmond, with the following members present:

Mr. Christian N. Braunlich, President
Mrs. Winsome E. Sears, Vice President
Mrs. Diane T. Atkinson
Mr. Oktay Baysal

Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr.
Mrs. Darla Edwards
Mr. Andrew Ko
Mrs. Joan E. Wodiska

Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Superintendent of
Public Instruction

Dr. Wright called the meeting to order at 9 a.m.

MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Dr. Wright asked for a moment of silence, and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ELECTION OF THE OFFICES OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, 2014-2016

Dr. Wright presided over the election of President and asked for nominations. Dr. Cannaday made a motion to nominate Mr. Chris Braunlich as President. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson. With no further nominations, the floor was closed for nominations. The Board voted unanimously for Mr. Braunlich as President of the Board of Education. After the vote, Mr. Braunlich presided over the meeting.

Mr. Braunlich asked for nominations for Vice President. Dr. Baysal made a motion to nominate Mrs. Sears as Vice President. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Edwards. With no further nominations, the floor was closed for nominations of Vice President. The Board voted unanimously for Mrs. Sears as Vice President of the Board of Education.

Mr. Braunlich thanked Board members for their support. Mr. Braunlich also thanked Dr. Wright for her leadership of the Virginia Department of Education. Mr. Braunlich said that he believes Virginia has the best public school system in the United States of America. Nation-wide Virginia is at the top of every measure indicator which is a testament to Virginia teachers. He also acknowledged there are some persistent gaps in students' achievement. He indicated that the Board is determined to close the gaps

because every child in the Commonwealth, regardless of where they live and their circumstances, deserves an education that will make them citizens of the 21st Century. Mr. Braunlich noted the Board will work with Dr. Wright, the Secretary of Education, the Governor, and General Assembly.

Mrs. Sears expressed her thankfulness to her colleagues for electing her Vice President. She noted she hopes to “do no harm” and help those the Board is entrusted to.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 16, 2014, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wodiska and carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed in advance of the meeting.

NEW BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS

Mr. Braunlich welcomed new Board members James Dillard and Andrew Ko.

Mr. Dillard was unable to attend the meeting due to a long-standing family commitment. Mr. Dillard was appointed by Governor McAuliffe to serve a four-year term beginning January 30, 2014 through January 29, 2018.

Mr. Ko was appointed by Governor McAuliffe to serve a four-year term beginning January 30, 2014 through January 29, 2018.

RESOLUTIONS/RECOGNITION

A Resolution of Recognition was presented to Virginia Superintendent of the Year: Dr. Rita D. Bishop, Division Superintendent, Roanoke City Public Schools.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following persons spoke during public comment:

- Jim Batterson, spoke on engineering endorsement
- Carolyn Ostermann-Healey, spoke on proposed *Foreign Language Standards of Learning*
- Christina Jennings, spoke on proposed *Foreign Language Standards of Learning*
- David Winn, spoke on proposed *Foreign Language Standards of Learning*
- Helen Small, spoke on proposed *Foreign Language Standards of Learning*
- Nicole Dooley, spoke on one-year extension of the ESEA waiver
- Gladys Brenner, spoke on Standards of Learning assessments and teacher preparation/teacher salaries

SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

The Honorable Anne Holton, Secretary of Education, addressed the Board. She thanked Board members for their public service and congratulated the newly elected president and vice president. Holton indicated her delight in serving as Secretary because she attended public schools in Roanoke, Richmond, and northern Virginia, and her children attended public schools in Virginia. She noted that because of the hard work done by the Board, local school boards, superintendents, principals, teachers and students, Virginia has one of the top K-12 school systems in the nation. The Secretary hopes to partner closely with the Board over the next four years, working collaboratively with localities on education issues.

Secretary Holton noted that the Virginia Department of Education and the Board have an opportunity to work with localities to raise up underperforming schools performance. She noted Virginia's accountability system is ahead of many other states, and is a large part why we have a great school system. The Secretary encouraged Board members to revisit all policies to see what can still be made better. She noted Virginia has the opportunity to lead the nation yet again in the next generation of accountability. The General Assembly has made some decisions regarding SOL assessments and created an advisory committee to look at further reforms. Secretary Holton indicated her support for looking more at growth measures and computer adaptive testing. Another issue the Secretary noted as wanting to work with the Board on is the bridge from K-12 education to community colleges, institutions of higher education and the work force.

The Secretary introduced the following members of her staff: Jenny O'Halleron, Deputy Secretary of Education for K-12; Dietra Trent, Deputy Secretary of Education for higher education; and Elizabeth Creamer, coordinator of workforce development.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) for a Passing Score for the Praxis II Family and Consumer Sciences Test (5122)

With the Board's approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved (1) a pass score of 153 (67 raw-score points) for the Praxis II Family and Consumer Sciences (5122) test with an implementation date of July 1, 2015, and (2) allow the acceptance of passing scores for initial licensure for individuals who took the currently-approved licensure assessment [Praxis II Family and Consumer Sciences (0121/5121)] prior to July 1, 2015.

Final Review of Proposed Revisions to the Procedure for Adjusting Grievances (8 VAC 20-90-10 et seq.) (Proposed Stage)

With the Board's approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved the proposed revisions to the *Procedure for Adjusting Grievances*, 8 VAC 20-90-10 et seq. (Proposed Stage).

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

Final Review of Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Opening Prior to Labor Day from Mecklenburg County Public Schools

Mrs. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- Mecklenburg County Public Schools is basing its waiver request on five programs designed to ensure that its students are successful academically, graduating on time, and developing the skills to be productive citizens in the 21st century work force. The five programs are:
 - ✓ Project based learning (PBL), emphasizing 21st century skills;
 - ✓ Career and character education;
 - ✓ Expanded dual enrollment, in conjunction with Southside Virginia Community College;
 - ✓ Residency program with Longwood University for teachers pursuing a master's degree in special education; and
 - ✓ Literacy camp with Longwood University for at-risk students.

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to deny Mecklenburg County Public Schools' request to begin school prior to Labor Day for its elementary and middle schools. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Sears and carried with six "yes" votes from Mrs. Edwards, Mrs. Sears, Mr. Braunlich, Dr. Cannaday, Mrs. Atkinson, and Mr. Ko and two "no" votes from Dr. Baysal and Mrs. Wodiska.

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to approve Mecklenburg County Public Schools' request to begin school prior to Labor Day for its high school. The motion carried with a unanimous vote.

Final Review of Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Opening Prior to Labor Day from Nottoway County Public Schools

Mrs. Anne Wescott presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- Nottoway County Public Schools is committed to increasing the number of students who graduate from high school and pursue postsecondary education. Approximately 37 percent of the county's adults over age 25 do not have high school diplomas, and only 8 percent of those persons over age 25 have a baccalaureate degree or higher. To achieve this goal, Nottoway County Public Schools proposes an innovative program titled PACE, Partnerships to Achieve Continuing Education. At each grade level (PK-12), activities have been planned to expose all students to higher education and career options. These activities will be documented on a student record card placed in each student's scholastic record. This record will be used in career planning discussions, and incorporated into instructional activities with the students, individually and in groups.
- The school division plans to use project-based learning so that students will develop interests in different career opportunities as they work on real-life problem-solving situations. The program will focus on STEM (science,

technology, engineering and mathematics) as well as 21st century skills to prepare students for college and career opportunities.

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to deny Nottoway County Public Schools' request for its elementary and middle schools to begin school prior to Labor Day. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ko and carried with six "yes" votes from Mrs. Edwards, Mrs. Sears, Mr. Braunlich, Dr. Cannaday, Mrs. Atkinson, and Mr. Ko and two "no" votes from Dr. Baysal and Mrs. Wodiska.

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to approve Nottoway County Public Schools' request for its high school to begin school prior to Labor Day. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ko and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Opening Prior to Labor Day from Cumberland County Public Schools

Mrs. Anne Wescott presented this item. Dr. Amy Griffin, superintendent, represented Cumberland County Public Schools. Mrs. Westcott's presentation included the following:

- The Cumberland County School Board is requesting a pre-Labor Day waiver to implement an innovative program entitled CuCPS Project 21 for Cumberland High School, Cumberland Middle School, and Cumberland Elementary School. The program includes implementation of 21st Century learning skills, application of Project Based Learning in the classroom, and promotion of career readiness for all students. The program is designed so that the school division can work in collaboration with other Region VIII schools which have these goals, as well as with Longwood University.
- The waiver request indicates that starting before Labor Day would mirror the schedules of most Region VIII schools and of most colleges and universities (including Southside Virginia Community College (SVCC), J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College, Liberty University, Longwood University, Norfolk State University, and Virginia State University. All of these colleges and universities start summer school in late May. Alignment of the calendars would facilitate participation in regional professional development activities, allow students to take summer college classes, increase the opportunities available to students, and enable teachers to take advantage of summer workshops and courses.
- All three Cumberland schools also take advantage of student teachers and practicum students from Longwood University, and the Longwood Partnership students actually hold classes at Cumberland Elementary School for half of the day. These student teacher cooperative and practicum experiences are facilitated by a schedule that aligns with Longwood's schedule.
- The school division also included in its request a discussion of professional development and dual enrollment and other programs at the high school level. The request noted that the school division is often unable to accommodate student teachers due to calendar misalignment, school division teachers are unable to attend professional development provided by colleges during the summer, and it is difficult to share regional professional development when many of the other school divisions have pre-Labor Day openings.

Dr. Griffin presented a brief overview of the request.

The Board's discussion included:

- Mrs. Atkinson indicated her support for the division's programs, but cautioned that the Board is limited by the provisions of the *Code of Virginia*. Mrs. Atkinson noted that Longwood's program starts on August 25th which conflicts with start date indicated by Cumberland County.
- Dr. Cannaday commended Cumberland County's approach for serving children, but noted

his concern that the *Code of Virginia* does not allow Board members to approve the request for the elementary and middle schools, as those programs are not dependent on a pre-Labor Day opening.

- Mrs. Wodiska said Dr. Griffin presented a compelling case to the Board stating why Cumberland County needs to start school before Labor Day. Mrs. Wodiska said disconnecting the high school from the elementary and middle schools will create operational inefficiencies, and additional costs will create a hardship for Cumberland County.
- Mrs. Sears thanked Dr. Griffin for presenting additional information requested by Board at the January meeting. Mrs. Sears said she can see how the waiver applies to the high school but it is difficult to justify for the elementary and middle schools.
- Mrs. Edwards commended Dr. Griffin for her leadership of Cumberland County's great programs. She thanked Dr. Griffin for answering questions about parent involvement and outreach to the community. Mrs. Edwards said she agreed with her colleagues that it is hard to justify the request for the elementary and middle schools based on the confines of the law.
- Mr. Ko indicated to Dr. Griffin he was impressed with her rigor and that she made a compelling case but he will recommend the waiver for the high school and not the elementary and middle schools. Mr. Ko thanked Dr. Griffin for the positive things she is doing in Cumberland County.
- Mr. Braunlich suggested inviting members of the General Assembly to visit the schools in Cumberland County to show them what will happen if they lose the waiver.
- Dr. Wright thanked Dr. Griffin for her leadership. Dr. Wright suggested Longwood College present their lab school application to the Board as it may give Cumberland County another opportunity to link with a school authorized to open before Labor Day.

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to deny Cumberland County Public Schools' request for its elementary and middle schools to begin school prior to Labor Day. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried with six "yes" votes from Mrs. Edwards, Mrs. Sears, Mr. Braunlich, Dr. Cannaday, Mrs. Atkinson, and Mr. Ko and two "no" votes from Dr. Baysal and Mrs. Wodiska.

Mrs. Wodiska made a motion to approve Cumberland County Public Schools' request for its high school to open prior to Labor Day. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ko and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Updated Corrective Action Plan and Memorandum of Understanding with Sussex County School Board and the Virginia Board of Education

Dr. Kathleen Smith, director, office of school improvement, presented this item. Dr. Arthur Jarrett, Jr., superintendent, represented Sussex County Public Schools. Dr. Smith's presentation included the following:

- Sussex County Public Schools was identified for division-level review status in 2004 and entered into an initial MOU with the VBOE. On September 17, 2009, Sussex County Public Schools appeared before the VBOE to enter into a second MOU for Sussex County Public Schools. This MOU was in effect until all schools were *Fully*

Accredited or the VBOE released Sussex County Public Schools from the MOU. The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) has provided ongoing technical assistance and monitored the implementation of the division’s corrective action plan.

- In 2012-2013, Sussex County Public Schools had two schools identified as persistently low-achieving priority schools in accordance with Virginia’s approved *Application for U.S. Department of Education Flexibility from Certain Requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA): Sussex Central Middle School (Tier 1–grades 4-7) and Ellen W. Chambliss Elementary (Tier I–grades K-3). In 2013-2014, both schools completed the three-year School Improvement Grant (SIG) cycle and the data indicated that neither school was considered low-achieving priority schools.
- In 2013-2014, Sussex County Public Schools consolidated its elementary and middle schools and closed three schools. Sussex County Public Schools now has three schools on one campus: Sussex Central Elementary School, grades K-5; Sussex Central Middle School, grades 6-8; and Sussex Central High School, grades 9-12. Because of the change in school configuration, an updated corrective action plan and MOU was required.
- A division-level instructional audit was completed December 12-13, 2013. Evidence for the following indicators was examined. The audit included a comprehensive review of the following indicators:

Category	Indicators
Leadership	Division provides guidance to administrators regarding expectations for monitoring the written and taught curriculum, and providing feedback to teachers; division monitors school-level compliance monitoring the written and taught curriculum, and providing feedback to teachers.
Written Curriculum	The curriculum maps, guides, and unit plans are aligned with the state standards’ Curriculum Framework Essential Knowledge and Skills in both content and cognitive levels.
	The sequence and pacing of curriculum maps, guides, and unit plans considers state standards’ Curriculum Framework Essential Knowledge and Skills and state assessment Blueprints to provide realistic pacing for content mastery of necessary knowledge and skills.
	The suggested learning experiences in the curriculum guides and unit plans provide a variety of suggestions but allow for flexibility in implementation, include suggestions for differentiation, demonstrate an understanding of the needs of the age group, and help make learning relevant for students.
	The written curriculum includes multiple assessment strategies and instruments that are aligned with adequate content coverage and provide fair and consistent results.
	The resources available (including time, scheduling, personnel, and materials) support the full implementation of the curriculum.
Professional Development	The division works collaboratively with the school to support, monitor, provide feedback on professional development activities that are aligned with the state standards’ Curriculum Framework Essential Knowledge and Skills <i>and</i> connect teaching to student learning outcomes.

Memorandum of Understanding

The proposed updated Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Sussex County School Board and the Virginia Board of Education will be in place until all Sussex County Public Schools are *Fully Accredited*.

For purposes of this MOU, the Sussex County School Board and the central office staff will adopt four key priorities and implement essential actions to comply with the Standards of Quality and improve student achievement.

1. Teacher Quality
2. Division Leadership
3. Division Curricula Guide Alignment
4. Division Professional Development

The responsibilities of the Sussex County School Board and the Sussex County Public Schools are:

1. The Sussex County School Board will submit an updated corrective action plan to the Virginia Board of Education for approval. The corrective action plan will include the expected outcome data related to each essential action and indication of whether the data will be reported monthly, quarterly, and/or annually to the local board. The corrective action plan will document local reporting to the board and modifications that may be required to the plan. Documentation on reports to the board will be provided to the Department monthly.
2. If additions to the corrective action plan are required by the Virginia Department of Education, the Division Superintendent will be notified. The Division Superintendent will share with the local board any additions that are required.
3. The Sussex County School Board will provide written summative reports on progress made in meeting or exceeding MOU agreements and expectations to the Virginia Board of Education and the Department of Education, as requested.
4. The Sussex County School Board and the Division Superintendent will appear before the Virginia Board of Education, as requested, to provide reports and answer questions about the implementation of the MOU and corrective action plan.
5. The Sussex County School Board members and the Division Superintendent will participate annually in board and superintendent training, as required in the Standards of Quality § 22.1-253.13:5.D, and provided by or in collaboration with the Department of Education.

Technical assistance will be provided at least monthly by a contractor assigned to Sussex County Public Schools by the Department of Education. This contractor will report monthly to the Office of School Improvement on the steps taken by Sussex County Public Schools to implement the corrective action plan.

Essential Actions Corrective Action Plan

As a result of the division-level instructional audit as well as previous division-level findings, the following essential actions are required in the division's corrective action plan:

Number	Essential Action
1.0	Teacher Quality
1.1	The central office staff and principals under the direction of the superintendent will develop and monitor individual action plans to reduce provisional licenses.
1.2	Sussex County Public Schools will commit to hiring personnel who are the most qualified for the position vacancy.
1.3	Sussex County Public Schools will provide written reports as requested by the Virginia Board of Education (as needed and as appropriate) on current instructional vacancies, number of teachers on provisional licenses, and progress on

Number	Essential Action
	individual action plans to reach full licensure.
2.0	Division Leadership
2.1*	The division will establish a procedure for providing summative feedback to school administrators on implementing and monitoring the written and taught curriculum.
2.2	The division will modify the existing teacher observation tool and set expectations as to how the observation tool will be utilized by administrators to provide explicit feedback on the alignment of the written, taught and assessed curriculum utilizing the Virginia Department of Education resources.
2.3	The division will initiate a plan to set expectations for a midyear review of lesson plans in each of the three schools.
2.4*	The central office staff and principals under the direction of the superintendent will plan, monitor and implement a plan to ensure that students graduate from high school on time.
2.5*	Using the quarterly report approved by the Virginia Department of Education, the central office staff and principals under the direction of the superintendent will provide the department data as required and will include recommendations for modifications to the corrective action plan that demonstrate accountability for results. The central office staff and principal under the direction of the superintendent will meet monthly with the assigned auditor to discuss the implementation of the essential actions indicated in the academic review.
3.0	Division Curricula Guide Alignment
3.1*	The division will enhance the local curricula guides to align with Standards of Learning and the Curriculum Framework in both content and cognitive level; facilitate students' use of higher level thinking skills through big ideas; and align teaching strategies, assessments, and resources with the Curriculum Framework.
4.0	Division Professional Development
4.1	The division will revise the Professional Development Plan to create structured time for teachers/principals to continue practice with unpacking the standards and planning to provide instructional experiences and assessments that match content and cognitive level.
4.2	The division will utilize the Office of School Improvement resources on the Virginia Department of Education's Web site, midyear school feedback on lesson plan templates, and actual lesson plans to provide administrators with professional development on lesson plan development, with a focus on content and cognitive level; linking big ideas, writing objectives that include behavior, conditions and criteria for students; and, using student learning data to differentiate instruction.
4.3*	The central office staff and principals under the direction of the superintendent will implement a data monitoring process with accountability for results and link school and division professional development to improving student achievement as supported by assessment results and other data.

*These essential actions were included in the previous MOU under Shared Leadership.

- The division's corrective action plan is included as Attachment C. The corrective action plan includes the expected outcome data related to each essential action and indication of when the data will be reported (monthly, quarterly, and/or annually) to the local board. The corrective action plan will document local reporting to the board and modifications that may be required to the plan. Documentation on reports from the Superintendent to the local board will be provided to the department monthly.

The Board's discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears gave a brief overview of the condition of the schools in Sussex County when Dr. Jarrett assumed the position of division superintendent and how he has begun to address some of the problems.
- Mrs. Atkinson expressed appreciation to Dr. Jarrett for coming before the Board and commended the work they are getting ready to do.
- Mr. Braunlich asked how consolidating buildings will improve the quality of instruction. Dr. Jarrett said Sussex County has limited resources and having schools on one campus with updated facilities will save operational funding, which can be redirected and used educating students in the classroom.

- Dr. Cannaday commended the Sussex school board for making tough decisions to allow the superintendent to do what needs to be done.

Dr. Baysal made a motion to approve the updated Memorandum of Understanding and corrective action plan for Sussex County Public Schools. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Edwards and carried with seven “yes” votes. Mrs. Wodiska was not available to vote.

First Review of the Findings from the Division-Level Review and Memorandum of Understanding for Franklin City Public Schools

Dr. Kathleen Smith presented this item. Mrs. Edna King, chair of the Franklin City school board, and Dr. Michelle Belle, superintendent, represented Franklin City Public Schools. Dr. Smith’s presentation included the following:

- The Standards of Quality (SOQ) require local school boards to maintain Fully Accredited schools and to take corrective actions for schools that are not Fully Accredited. Further, when the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) has obtained evidence through the academic review that the failure of schools within a division to achieve full accreditation status is related to division-level failure to implement the SOQ, the VBOE may require a division-level academic review.

§ [22.1-253.13:3](#). Standard 3. Accreditation, other standards and evaluation.

...Each local school board shall maintain schools that are fully accredited pursuant to the standards of accreditation as prescribed by the Board of Education. Each local school board shall review the accreditation status of all schools in the local school division annually in public session. Within the time specified by the Board of Education, each school board shall submit corrective action plans for any schools within its school division that have been designated as not meeting the standards as approved by the Board....

... When the Board of Education has obtained evidence through the school academic review process that the failure of schools within a division to achieve full accreditation status is related to division level failure to implement the Standards of Quality, the Board may require a division level academic review. After the conduct of such review and within the time specified by the Board of Education, each school board shall submit for approval by the Board a corrective action plan, consistent with criteria established by the Board and setting forth specific actions and a schedule designed to ensure that schools within its school division achieve full accreditation status. Such corrective action plans shall be part of the relevant school division's comprehensive plan pursuant to § [22.1-253.13:6](#)....

- All three schools in Franklin City Public Schools have been Accredited with Warning for two consecutive years, and have federal sanctions due to not meeting the federal annual measurable objectives (AMOs). The school academic review process conducted in the 2012-2103 school year revealed evidence that the failure of the schools within the division to achieve full accreditation status is related to division-level failure to implement the SOQ, consistent with Section 221.-253.13:3 of the SOQ.
- On October 24, 2013, the VBOE placed Franklin City Public Schools in division-level academic review status and authorized the Department of Education to begin the review process.

Overview of Division-Level Review Process and Findings

The division-level review process was conducted December 1-5, 2013. Three separate reviews were conducted.

First, a full academic review of the division’s curricula in the four core areas was completed by the VDOE. A Report of Findings for this review is included as Attachment B. Overall, there are two major areas of concern regarding curriculum alignment:

Curricula Alignment 1:

Professional development is needed in the alignment of the written, taught, and assessed curricula.

Curricula Alignment 2:

There was little evidence that principals and/or teachers are provided regular feedback after classroom observations by the central office administration.

Second, the Licensure and Human Resources Audit was focused as a follow-up to the review conducted nine months prior (March 2013) by Dr. James Lanham. Dr. Lanham's review shared 13 significant findings directly related to personnel, 27 additional findings not directly related to personnel, eight (8) commendations, and 26 recommendations.

The purpose of this review (December 2013) was to follow-up on the actions taken by the school division to address Dr. Lanham's significant findings and recommendations. A summary of findings from the December 2013 review is included as Attachment C.

Of the 13 significant findings identified in Dr. Lanham's review, seven (7) are identified as "resolved" while the remaining six (6) remain "unresolved." Additionally, six (6) "additional/new" findings were identified during this review.

Overall, there are two major human resources findings regarding licensed instructional staff:

Human Resources 1:

There continue to be administrators (directors, supervisors, and specialists) who work with instructional programs at the division level and/or serve as a resource to teachers who are not endorsed in the area of responsibility.

Human Resources 2:

There continue to be teachers teaching outside of their endorsement area.

Lastly, AdvancED was contracted by the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) to conduct a special review of the school division's purpose, direction, governance and leadership.

AdvancED is an international organization that provides accreditation, research, and professional services to schools and divisions in Virginia and more than 70 countries. A special review team was appointed by AdvancED to make an on-site review to gather information and evidence needed to determine if the actions and behaviors within the school system, its board members and leadership were in compliance with the AdvancED Standards for Quality School Systems including, but not limited to, Standard 1: Purpose and Direction and Standard 2: Governance and Leadership. These standards are consistent with requirements of the Standards of Quality.

Specifically, the AdvancED component of the division-level review found that Franklin City Public Schools appeared to be in violation of the following AdvancED standards/indicators:

Purpose and Direction Standard 1:

The system maintains and communicates at all levels of the organization a purpose and direction for continuous improvement that commit to high expectations for learning as well as shared values and beliefs about teaching and learning. (Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4)

Governance and Leadership Standard 2:

The system operates under governance and leadership that promote and support student performance and system effectiveness. (Indicators 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6)

Memorandum of Understanding

The proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Franklin City School Board and the Virginia Board of Education is included as Attachment D. The MOU, subject to annual review and revisions by the Board of Education, will be in place until all Franklin City Public Schools are Fully Accredited. For purposes of this MOU, the Franklin City School Board and the central office staff will adopt four key priorities and implement essential actions to comply with the Standards of Quality and improve student achievement.

1. Curricula Alignment
2. Human Resource Management and Quality of Leadership, Teachers and Support
3. Purpose and Direction
4. Leadership and Governance

The following are responsibilities of the Franklin City School Board and Franklin City Public Schools:

1. The Franklin City School Board will provide the Superintendent of Public Instruction the names and credentials of its top three finalists to fill a vacancy of Division Superintendent prior to making an offer to the preferred candidate.
2. The Franklin City School Board will direct the Division Superintendent to consult with the Superintendent of Public Instruction or designee on all recommendations regarding instructional programs or instructional personnel prior to being submitted to the local board for approval. If the Franklin City School Board takes action on instructional programs or instructional personnel contrary to the recommendations of the Superintendent of Public Instruction or designee, the board will provide a written justification to the Superintendent of Public Instruction.
3. The Franklin City School Board will approve a corrective action plan for the essential actions identified in the MOU and submit this plan to the Virginia Board of Education for review and approval at a time to be determined by the Board of Education President and Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Franklin City School Board will show evidence that the plan was shared with stakeholders for feedback and this feedback was acted upon in the corrective action plan submitted to the Virginia Board of Education for approval.
4. The Franklin City School Board will direct the Division Superintendent to provide the local board weekly updates on the steps taken to complete the essential actions in the corrective action plan and submit a monthly update to the Virginia Department of Education.
5. The Franklin City School Board will direct the Division Superintendent, upon request, to provide the Virginia Department of Education documentation on planned uses and actual expenditures of state funds allocated to the division. The Department will review and approve planned uses and actual expenditures of federal funds.
6. The Franklin City School Board and the Division Superintendent will appear before the Virginia Board of Education, as requested, to provide reports and answer questions about the implementation of the MOU and corrective action plan.
7. The Franklin City School Board members and the Division Superintendent will participate annually in board and superintendent training, as required in the Standards of Quality § 22.1- 253.13:5.D, and provided by or in collaboration with the Department of Education.
8. The Franklin City School Board will permit the Superintendent of Public Instruction's designee to meet with the local board in an ex-officio, non-voting, member capacity should the division fail to have all of its schools Fully Accredited by the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year.

The following are responsibilities of the Virginia Board of Education and Department of Education:

1. The Superintendent of Public Instruction will assign a designee to serve as the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) to Franklin City Public Schools.
2. The Director of the Office of School Improvement (OSI) will coordinate with the CAO, lead turnaround partners assigned to the division, division staff, and other VDOE offices to provide technical assistance in support of the MOU and corrective action plan.
3. The CAO will provide administrative oversight over processes, procedures, and strategies that are implemented in support of the MOU and funded by targeted federal and state funds and will share feedback with both the Division Superintendent and the Franklin City School Board.
4. The CAO, in consultation with the VDOE, will approve all federal funding regarding school improvement funds or Title I prior to being submitted for reimbursement.
5. The CAO will work closely with the school and division personnel to implement instruction aligned to the Standards of Learning. The CAO will report monthly to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Office of School Improvement on the steps taken by Franklin City Public Schools to implement the essential actions in the corrective action plan.

Essential Actions

As a result of the division-level review, certain essential actions are required in the division’s corrective action plan to be submitted for approval by the Virginia Board of Education. The comprehensive nature of these actions will require the local board to focus its work on a few immediate priorities while making plans to implement actions that are more systemic over a longer period of time with input from the community.

Immediate Priority Actions:

The corrective action plan will include timelines that place immediate priority on essential actions that will have a direct impact on student achievement:

1. Curricula alignment
2. Quality of leadership, teachers and support

Systemic Planning Actions:

At the same time, the Franklin City School Board and the Division Superintendent must begin working on systemic governance and strategic planning issues cited in the review:

1. Purpose and direction
2. Governance and leadership

An indication of whether each essential action should be considered an immediate priority or systemic actions over a longer period of time is indicated below:

Immediate Priority or Systemic Planning	Number	Essential Action
	1.0	Curricula Alignment
Immediate Priority	1.1	Provide staff development to all teachers on unpacking standards and aligning the written/taught/tested curriculum.

Immediate Priority or Systemic Planning	Number	Essential Action
Immediate Priority	1.2	Provide and document feedback from division administrators to principals regarding observed curriculum alignment and implementation of professional development during monthly division administrative classroom walk through observations.
Immediate Priority	1.3	Provide new/refresher training each year to school-level administrators on using the Formal Observation and Summative Teacher Evaluation tools to document evidence of curriculum alignment and the five components of the taught curriculum listed in the Academic Review Evaluation Tools.
Immediate Priority	1.4	Monitor formal observation reports completed by school-based administrators for the incorporation of detailed and specific feedback regarding the quality and alignment of the instruction observed. Revise observation forms/templates if necessary.
Immediate Priority	1.5	Develop a plan for revising division-level curriculum documents to address issues revealed through the Academic Review Process (alignment to content and cognitive level, alignment to VDOE blueprint, incorporation of specific learning activities and model assessments).
Immediate Priority	1.6	Revise Formal Observation Form to reflect criteria in the Lesson Observation Evaluation Tool.
Immediate Priority	1.7	Use results of the academic reviews in all schools to update required actions related to curricula alignment until all schools are <i>Fully Accredited</i> .
	2.0	<i>Human Resource Management and Quality of Leadership, Teachers and Support</i>
Immediate Priority	2.1	Practice and/or procedures (or Board-approved policy) should be revised to ensure teacher contracts are not executed and employees do not begin work until Human Resources can certify licensure eligibility ensuring a valid license with the proper endorsements will be in full force for the ensuing or current school year. Additionally, all other required documents should be in place.
Immediate Priority	2.2	Ensure that all administrators (directors, supervisors, and specialists) who work with instructional programs at the division level and/or serve as a resource to teachers are endorsed in the area of responsibility.
Immediate Priority	2.3	Substitute teachers (long-term or short-term) should operate under the permanent teacher's name and records in order to minimize confusion and errors. The status of only permanent teachers under contract should be considered as "Teachers of Record" on the Instructional Personnel and Licensure (IPAL) Verification Report.
Systemic Planning	2.4	Consider the impact of supplemental duties on staff.
Immediate Priority	2.5	Ensure that teachers are not teaching outside of their endorsement area.
Systemic Planning	2.6	Consider aligning the speech pathologist and school psychologist to higher pay scales competitive with surrounding localities.
Immediate Priority	2.7	School board policy states that sign-on bonuses are awarded to teachers meeting certain criteria ("...to full-time teachers new to the Division who meet the definition of "highly qualified" as defined by the federal "No Child Left Behind" legislation."). Review policy to ensure the potential for securing the best qualified candidates in hard-to-staff positions and consider whether this is the most effective use of Title II funding. Human Resources will verify whether the awarding of sign-on bonuses remains within the guidelines of school board policy.
Systemic Planning	2.8	All courses and sections taught should be considered as "equal value" or "importance" for IPAL reporting purposes. Schedules should not be designed to place lesser qualified teachers with courses during first semester with the idea that the IPAL Verification Report is submitted during second semester.
Systemic Planning	2.9	Consider providing co-teaching settings for courses when properly endorsed personnel are limited. This would possibly allow larger class enrollments with two accessible teachers and/or the possibility of certain online courses which would potentially free up staff, even temporarily.
Systemic Planning	2.10	Consider contracting with local community colleges, securing online programs and/or partnering with neighboring school divisions to provide instruction for courses when the division is unable to secure properly endorsed personnel.
	3.0	Purpose and Direction
Systemic Planning	3.1	Develop and implement a comprehensive, systematic process for establishing, reviewing and revising a clear purpose/direction for student achievement for the school system . The process must include participation by multiple stakeholder groups. The purpose/direction for the system must be reviewed and

Immediate Priority or Systemic Planning	Number	Essential Action
		<p>communicated on a regular basis, <i>pursuant to Code of Virginia, Section 22.1-253.13:6 (B) and Code of Virginia, Section 22.1-253.13: 6 (C).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Structure committees that have representation from various stakeholder groups to lead in the development/revision/update of the systemwide purpose and direction. b. Establish guidelines for committee work to ensure that the process is formalized and implemented with fidelity on a regular schedule. c. Devise a method of clear documentation of the process and a record of review and communication of the system's purpose and direction.
Systemic Planning	3.2	<p>Develop and implement a comprehensive, systematic process for establishing, reviewing and revising a clear purpose/direction for student achievement for each school in the system. The process must include participation by multiple stakeholder groups. The purpose/direction for each entity must be reviewed and communicated on a regular basis, and the school's purpose/direction must be aligned to the system's purpose/direction for student achievement, pursuant to <i>Code of Virginia, Section 22.1-253.13:6 (B) and Code of Virginia, Section 22.1- 253.13: 6 (C).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Structure committees that have representation from various stakeholder groups to lead in the development/revision/update of each school's purpose/direction. b. Establish guidelines for committee work to ensure that the process is formalized and implemented with fidelity on a regular schedule. c. Devise a method of clear documentation of the process and a record of review and communication of each school's purpose and direction.
Immediate Priority	3.3	<p>Establish and commit to clear levels of accountability for school system and school leadership that result in challenging, equitable learning experiences for all students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Review and revise, as necessary, job descriptions and actual job duties being performed by each central office position. b. Evaluate the job performance of each central office person on a regular basis to ensure there is accountability for and measurable evidence of supporting equitable and challenging educational programs for all students at each of the three schools. c. Evaluate the job performance of each school leader on a regular basis to ensure there is accountability for and measurable evidence of equitable and challenging learning experiences being implemented for all students. d. Analyze and use student achievement results, survey responses and all other available data as a means of holding system and school leadership accountable for effective professional practices that result in improved student achievement for all students. Document this accountability process publicly and on a consistent and regular basis.
Immediate Priority	3.4	<p>Evaluate the overall quality of all instructional interventions that have been implemented to improve student, school and system performance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify the various interventions and strategies being implemented. Develop and implement evaluation procedures for the interventions and strategies deployed to achieve improvement goals. b. Examine all supervisory and evaluation reports and use the results as one source to hold personnel accountable for improvements in student, school and system performance.
	4.0	Leadership and Governance
Systemic Planning	4.1	<p>Develop and implement a plan whereby the system's updated policies and practices require and give direction for a systemwide professional growth plan for all staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Review and update all Board policies and practices to ensure clear direction and support to increase student achievement. b. Ensure that an annual comprehensive needs assessment, inclusive of professional growth needs for all staff, is conducted. c. Provide requirements and direction, through policies and practices, for the development and implementation of a systemwide professional development plan for all staff. d. Monitor, in both formative and summative ways, the implementation and impact of the systemwide professional development plan.
Immediate Priority	4.2	<p>Ensure that all activities of school board meetings comply with applicable state and federal law to include Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) citations, <i>Code</i></p>

Immediate Priority or Systemic Planning	Number	Essential Action
		<p><i>of Virginia</i> and the Franklin City Public Schools Board Policy Manual.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Implement training opportunities for all board members to be trained in their roles and responsibilities and in state law, federal mandates, board policies, etc., regarding proper protocol for executive/closed sessions at board meetings. b. Restrict discussions and presentations in closed meetings to those items specifically allowed by law. c. Create open meeting reports of class, subject-area, grade-level and/or school-level performance data, pupil attendance, discipline and truancy data to be shared publicly on a routine basis. d. Establish and implement a formalized plan to ensure that all information regarding academic progress, Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments, benchmarks and the Lead Turnaround Partner program is routinely shared with internal and external stakeholders in a timely and open manner.
Systemic Planning	4.3	<p>Involve all stakeholder groups in the development of a revised, comprehensive plan for the school system and ensure the communication of the revised plan, vision and purpose to all stakeholders.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Utilize the committee as referenced in Essential Action 3.1, including 3.1 a.-c. and follow the same process to develop a Comprehensive Improvement Plan for Franklin City Schools. b. Schedule periodic review(s) of the Comprehensive Improvement Plan and involve stakeholder groups in the review process. Document evidence of the process and the extent of stakeholder involvement. c. Ensure that the Comprehensive Improvement Plan reflects the current reality of the system. d. Communicate in multiple ways in a timely manner the revised Comprehensive Improvement Plan and documented progress. e. Satisfy all public requests for information in a timely manner.
Systemic Planning	4.4	<p>Develop and implement a formal communication plan that is measurable and sustainable in order to ensure that school system information is shared with all stakeholders in a timely manner. Ensure that the communication plan is based on an expectation of shared responsibility for effective communication at all levels of the organization.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Designate a staff member to take the leadership role in sharing information internally and externally regarding all aspects of the system in a timely manner and to lead the development of the communication plan. b. Organize a committee with various stakeholder representatives to develop the communication plan. c. Engage community and parent volunteers in meaningful roles that support student achievement. d. Provide training for all levels of the organization in effective communication strategies.
Immediate Priority	4.5	<p>Implement supervision and evaluation processes consistently and regularly for all staff to improve professional practices and ensure student success.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Review/update job descriptions of central office supervisory and support personnel and evaluate actual duties being performed. b. Realign/restructure positions to more effectively deploy critical resources to serve student needs. c. Review supervisory and evaluation processes for all employees and ensure procedures and timelines are being followed appropriately. d. Ensure that the results of the supervision and evaluation processes are analyzed and used to monitor effective teaching practices and improve student learning.

The Board's discussion included:

- Mr. Braunlich asked Dr. Smith how many *Code* violations were found in Franklin City Public Schools. Dr. Smith said most of the violations occurred in hiring unlicensed personnel and licensed personnel that are not teaching in their endorsed areas. Dr. Smith

said there were ten violations and seven were related to things that should have been done this year. Dr. Smith said the AdvancED listed nine violations and four were *Code* violations.

- Dr. Cannaday said the most important relationship in a local school division is between the superintendent and the school board. Dr. Cannaday said the immediate issue is having the right person to partner with the Board. Dr. Cannaday said the school board should search for candidates that will implement the plan, have prior experience working in an environment like Franklin City, and have turned student achievement around. Dr. Cannaday said Franklin City school board and superintendent should work as a team to be successful.
- Mr. Ko clarified his comment during the Accountability Committee meeting when he asked Mrs. King about her definition of leadership. Mr. Ko said having the right leader is important in turning around a school.
- Mrs. Sears asked Mrs. King what will be done to correct the issues in Franklin City. Mrs. King said the report in the Board members' packet shows results of the academic reviews done in Franklin City in November. Mrs. King said Franklin City had already begun to correct those things relative to having a highly qualified staff. Mrs. King said when the review was done Franklin City had not received the IPAL report from the Department of Education. Mrs. King said they received their IPAL report two weeks ago and it showed that 99% of the teachers are highly qualified and teaching in their endorsed areas.
- Dr. Wright clarified that the IPAL (Instructional Personnel and Licensure) report is data provided by local school boards to the Department of Education to analyze personnel school divisions have already hired. Dr. Wright said Franklin City should have realized the data included unlicensed personnel before it was sent to the Department of Education. Dr. King said Franklin City received information on unlicensed personnel after the data was sent to the Department of Education.
- Dr. Smith noted that the academic review panel reported last spring that a chemistry and physics teacher was teaching an Algebra I and II 4x4 class and therefore those students received instruction for an entire year by a teacher not endorsed in Algebra.
- Mrs. Atkinson said the local school board is responsible for hiring licensed teachers. Mrs. Atkinson said a phone call to check verification would have handled the issue of unlicensed teachers. Mrs. Atkinson said school divisions should not wait for the IPAL report to identify unlicensed teachers.
- Mrs. Atkinson thanked Mrs. King and Dr. Belle for attending the Accountability Committee meeting. Mrs. Atkinson said the committee was frank about the degree of concern the Board has with the extent of deficiencies noted in governance, teacher licensure, curricula alignment, and professional development. Mrs. Atkinson said all of these components are necessary to provide opportunities for a good education to the children in Franklin City.
- Mrs. Sears said Franklin City did not address how they are going to ensure the programs will help children, how they will forge relationships with parents, and how they will boost teacher morale. Mrs. Sears noted the potential impact on the local economy.
- Mrs. King said she does not know who AdvancED surveyed in the community but there is excellent involvement of parents in Franklin City. Mrs. Sears noted that the AdvancED survey included responses from parents, businesses, city council, and media in Franklin

City. Mrs. Sears said she hopes the Franklin City school board will take this information seriously because they are violating the law.

- Mrs. Edwards said trust is the easiest thing to lose and the hardest to regain and it seems as if the Franklin City school board does not have that trust anymore. Mrs. Edwards suggested developing relationships not just between the school board and the superintendent but also between the school board and the community, the Board of Education, and the Department of Education. Mrs. Edwards said that parental involvement is wonderful but involvement should not be confused with engagement. Mrs. Edwards encouraged Franklin City to make things better by developing meaningful relationships and look for ways to sustain them.
- Dr. Cannaday said the focus should be on developing children who are able to compete in the global society, be responsible, and have a better quality of life. He noted the issue is not defending and responding to elements of the review, but rather the quality of life for these children. Dr. Cannaday said he is not interested in a response from Franklin City; he is interested in what children can do, who will hire them, and who will accept them into a community college or four-year university. Defending the data is a symptom of the fact that Franklin City is not clear on what the real challenge is.
- Mrs. Wodiska noted as a past school board member and president, she understands the roles and responsibilities of serving on a school board. Mrs. Wodiska said she is deeply concerned by the actions of the Franklin City school board. Mrs. Wodiska said the policies and practices of the governing board in Franklin City do not address conditions to support learning or professional development of staff. Mrs. Wodiska said the concerns raised by Board members should not be taken lightly. Mrs. Wodiska urged Franklin City to not try to defend the status quo but use this as an opportunity for their board to come together. Mrs. Wodiska asked that the entire Franklin City school board watch the tape of the Board's accountability and business meeting together, discuss it and move forward. Mrs. Wodiska also encouraged the entire Franklin City school board, if possible, to attend the Board's March meeting.
- Mr. Braunlich said the Board is empowered to supervise public schools in the state. Mr. Braunlich said this is a serious issue and the Franklin City school board will not be able to slide past it. Mr. Braunlich said the priority of the Board is doing what is right for the children in Franklin City.

The Board accepted for first review the Memorandum of Understanding for Franklin City Public Schools.

First Review of Proposed Revisions to the Regulations Governing the Employment of Professional Personnel (8 VAC 20-441-10 et seq.) (Reconsideration of Proposed Stage)

Mrs. Patty Pitts, assistant superintendent for teacher education and licensure, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- The *Regulations Governing the Employment of Professional Personnel* became effective April 20, 1994, and were amended effective March 28, 2003. On October 25, 2012, the Board of Education approved the Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA), which is required for executive branch review and the Virginia Registrar of

Regulations, pursuant to the Virginia Administrative Process Act (APA) and Executive Order 14 (2010). The NOIRA was filed with the Virginia Registrar, and the public comment period for the NOIRA concluded on January 30, 2013. No comments were received during the NOIRA public comment period. On June 27, 2013, the Board of Education approved the proposed *Regulations Governing the Employment of Personnel* (Proposed Stage) to undergo executive review.

- After the Board of Education approved the proposed *Regulations Governing the Employment of Personnel* (Proposed Stage) on June 27, 2013, the executive review process commenced. During this review, Part II Uniform Hiring of Teachers of the *Regulations Governing the Employment of Personnel* was stricken from the text because the *Constitution of Virginia* (Article VIII, Section 7) provides that “The supervision of schools in each school division shall be vested in a school board, to be composed of members selected in the manner, for the term, possessing the qualifications, and to the number provided by law.” The employment of teachers is the responsibility of a school board.

The Board’s discussion included:

- Mrs. Atkinson asked about the process for the proposed *Regulations Governing the Employment of Personnel*. Mrs. Pitts said that following approval by the Board, the regulations will continue through the executive review process by the Office of the Attorney General, the Department of Planning and Budget, the Secretary of Education, and the Governor. Upon approval by the Governor, the proposed regulations are published in the *Virginia Register*, and there is a 60-day public comment period. Once the 60-day comment period is complete, the regulations will be presented to the Board, with any changes as a result of the public comment, for final review and approval.

Dr. Baysal made a motion to waive first review and approve the proposed revisions to the *Regulations Governing the Employment of Professional Personnel* (Reconsideration of Proposed Stage). The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wodiska and carried unanimously.

First Review of Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) to Accredit the Teacher Education Program at Bridgewater College through a Process Approved by the Board of Education

Mrs. Patty Pitts presented this item. Mrs. Pitts introduced the following representatives from Bridgewater College: Dr. Carol Scheppard, Vice President and Dean for Academic Affairs, and Dr. Jean Roth Hawk, Interim Director, Teacher Education Programs and Professor of Education.

Mrs. Pitt’s presentation included the following:

- The *Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia* (8VAC20-542-10 et seq.) set forth the options for the accreditation of “professional education programs” at Virginia institutions of higher education. The regulations define the “professional education program” as the Virginia institution, college, school, department, or other administrative body within a Virginia institution of higher education, or another Virginia entity for a defined educator preparation program that is primarily responsible for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel.
- Section 20-542-60 of the *Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia* provides the standards and indicators for the Board of Education approved accreditation process. The four standards are as follows:

Standard 1: Program Design. The professional education program shall develop and maintain high quality programs that are collaboratively designed and based on identified needs of the preK-12 community.

Standard 2: Candidate Performance on Competencies for Endorsement Areas. Candidates in education programs shall demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to meet professional, state, and institutional standards to ensure student success.

Standard 3: Faculty in Professional Education Programs. Faculty in the professional education program represents well-qualified education scholars who are actively engaged in teaching and learning.

Standard 4: Governance and Capacity. The professional education program demonstrates the governance and capacity to prepare candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

- Section 207 of Title II of the Higher Education Act (HEA) reporting requirements mandate that the U.S. Secretary of Education collect data on standards for teacher certification and licensure, as well as data on the performance of teacher preparation programs. The law requires the Secretary to use these data in submitting its annual report on the quality of teacher preparation to Congress. In addition, states were required to develop criteria, procedures, and processes from which institutions at-risk of becoming low-performing and low-performing institutions could be identified.
- The professional education program is the Virginia institution, college, school, department, or other administrative body within a Virginia institution of higher education, or another Virginia entity for a defined educator preparation program that is primarily responsible for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel. The professional education program has a designated dean, director, or chair with authority and responsibility for overall administration and operation and is responsible for the alignment between the endorsement program competencies and the licensure regulations.
- The *Implementation Manual for the Regulations Governing Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia* (8VAC 20-542-10 et seq.) addresses the standards that govern the review and accreditation of the professional education program; standards for biennial review and approval of education programs; indicators of achievement of each standard; and procedures for overall implementation of the regulations. Professional education programs in Virginia seeking accreditation through a process approved by the Board of Education must follow procedures and timelines as prescribed by the Department of Education.
- Each Virginia professional education program seeking accreditation through a process approved by the Board of Education will be reviewed on a seven-year review cycle. Documents, such as the Institutional Report, annual data reports, On-site Team's Report of Findings, and Institutional Response (if needed), are part of the review process.
- At the March 29, 2007, meeting, the Board of Education approved a recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure to grant continuing accreditation to the professional education program at Bridgewater College.
- Bridgewater College currently offers the following Virginia Board of Education approved teaching endorsement areas at the undergraduate level:

Approved Program Teaching Endorsement Areas
Career and Technology Education: Family and Consumer Sciences
Computer Science*
Driver Education (Add-on endorsement)
Elementary Education PreK-6
English
English as a Second Language PreK-12
Foreign Languages PreK-12: French
Foreign Language PreK-12: Spanish
Health and Physical Education PreK-12
History and Social Sciences
Mathematics

Approved Program Teaching Endorsement Areas
Mathematics – Algebra I (Add-on endorsement)
Music Education: Instrumental PreK-12
Music Education: Vocal/Choral PreK-12
Science: Biology
Science: Chemistry
Science: Physics
Theatre Arts PreK-12
Visual Arts PreK-12

- *The on-site review team was notified that the Computer Science teaching endorsement area will be discontinued effective the spring 2013 semester.
- Bridgewater College requested accreditation through the Board of Education approved process. An on-site visit to review the program was conducted on April 27-30, 2013. Attached are Appendix B - *Professional Education Program Review Team Report of Findings* and Appendix F - *Bridgewater College's Response to the Professional Education Program Review of Findings*.
- The overall recommendation of the on-site review team was that the professional education program be "Accredited with Stipulations." The team made this recommendation based on the information provided in the 2013 *Institutional Report*; the evidence available during the April 27-30, 2013, on-site visit; and Bridgewater College's response to the on-site review team report.

The following are the review team's recommendations for each of the four standards:

Standard	Review Team Recommendations
Standard 1: Program Design	Met
Standard 2: Candidate Performance on Competencies for Endorsement Areas	Met Minimally with Significant Weaknesses
Standard 3: Faculty in Professional Education Programs	Met
Standard 4: Governance and Capacity	Met Minimally with Significant Weaknesses

- The following strengths and weaknesses were noted in Standards 1, 2, 3, and 4. Specific details for each standard are identified in the *Report of Findings* (refer to Appendix B).

...II. Findings for Each Standard

A. *Standard 1: Program Design. The professional education program shall develop and maintain high quality programs that are collaboratively designed and based on identified needs of the PreK-12 community....*

Strengths:

1. The variety and diversity of field experiences placements are commendable.
2. The updated mission, conceptual framework, and goals of the Bridgewater College Teacher Education Program (BC TEP) are well-defined. Also, the reporting from weekly department meetings indicates a collaborative response to implementing the new foundation for the Teacher Education Program (TEP).
3. The Mid-Valley Consortium for Teacher Education is an efficient collaboration among the nine partner institutions of higher education offering approved education programs. The

organization provides a strong, well-trained cadre of clinical faculty to its members, an equitable distribution of scarce resources, and institutional autonomy to meet the needs of each entity's particular student population.

Weaknesses:

1. There is a lack of diversity in clinical faculty, cooperating teachers, and college supervisors. (Refer to Appendix B, pages 12-15, Standard 1, 6a.)
2. More efficient management of individual student placements by course is needed. While it is the consensus of stakeholders that the current procedure of instructors making their own placements and individual students maintaining their own practicum experience records works, there also is overall agreement among faculty that the procedure is cumbersome and is not an efficient means to ensure that candidates receive the diverse placements needed. It is recommended that a new position, course release, or other type of compensation is needed to centralize field placement duties and responsibilities, including recording student placement history. (Refer to Appendix B, pages 15-16, Standard 1, 6b.)
3. Students, cooperating teachers, former students, and college supervisors mentioned the need for more instruction on characterizing, teaching, and managing students with special needs in the general education classroom. (Refer to Appendix B, pages 9-10, Standard 1, 5a.)

B. Standard 2: Candidate Performance on Competencies for Endorsement Areas. Candidates in education programs shall demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to meet professional, state, and institutional standards to ensure student success. Candidates shall demonstrate the competencies specified in 8VAC 20-542-70 through 8VAC 20-542-600....

Strengths:

1. Candidates are regularly evaluated on consistent forms (i.e., Mid-Valley Consortium student teaching evaluation form) which allow comparisons.
2. Candidates learn to evaluate their impact on student learning through the *Student Achievement Performance Assessment (SAPA)*.
3. Candidates evidence exemplary use of technology and integration of technology in instruction.
4. The Director of Teacher Education demonstrates an understanding of the need for the assessment system to be continuous and systematic. The Director monitors candidates at multiple transition points and provides key information to key constituents to ensure program review and improvement.

Weaknesses:

1. The assessment system is comprised of individual components that have not been clearly identified to all stakeholders. Also, the BC TEP assessment system does not interface with the system used by the College. During the interview with review team members, faculty from the arts and sciences reported to the review team they did not have access to all candidate data to review. Moreover, the faculty from arts and sciences are not aware that they need to have access to this information. (Refer to Appendix B, pages 29-31, Standard 2, 2b.)
2. Per the BC TEP Director, the assessment system is part of a broader Bridgewater College

assessment system and is managed in different locations, dependent upon the data. The Institutional Effectiveness Assessment data are stored on the campus TK20 system. There also are data managed by the BC TEP through the Director of Teacher Education.

The assessment system is managed totally by the Director of Teacher Education. The Director of Teacher Education gathers information from various areas, enters the candidate data into a spreadsheet, aggregates the data, and meets with staff in each department to discuss the data and any need for curriculum revision or alignment. Information flow is only in one direction. How final decisions impacting program and curricular changes are made based on the data shared is not clear. (Refer to Appendix B, pages 29-31, Standard 2, 2b.)

3. The candidates identified the need for more instruction/information for working with students with special needs in inclusive classrooms. (Refer to Appendix B, pages 27-28, Standard 2, 2a.)

C. Standard 3: Faculty in Professional Education Programs. Faculty in the professional education program represent well-qualified education scholars who are actively engaged in teaching and learning....

Strengths:

1. Overall, faculty and administration commitment to the teacher education program was evidenced through interviews by the on-site review team with Bridgewater College administrators, faculty, and candidates in the Bridgewater College Teacher Education Program.
2. Overall, the faculty evidences strong credentials to support the Bridgewater College Teacher Education Program.

Weaknesses:

1. There is no explicit plan for recruiting minority faculty. (Refer to Appendix B, page 40, Standard 3, 3c.)
2. There is no full-time faculty member with expertise and experience in special education. (Refer to Appendix B, page 37, Standard 3, 1e.)

D. Standard 4: Governance and Capacity. The professional education program demonstrates the governance and capacity to prepare candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards....

Strengths:

1. Faculty members are readily available to provide advisement to Bridgewater College TEP candidates.
2. With the exception of special education, faculty evidence expertise in the specific content area knowledge.
3. Technology is used by faculty to teach teacher candidates how to effectively integrate technology in the PreK–12 classroom.

Weaknesses:

1. The program administrator is responsible for too many roles without sufficient administrative release time. The position description for the Director of Teacher Education is quite comprehensive. Many institutions employ a full-time administrator such as a dean to perform these roles. In addition to the roles described in the position description, the program administrator serves in informal roles as assessment coordinator and candidate placement coordinator. A partial solution to this problem might be to hire a data coordinator to coordinate the assessment system and make field placements for candidates within the Bridgewater College Teacher Education Program. Also, the Director of Teacher Education is the liaison to the Virginia Department of Education, Division of Teacher Education and Licensure, to ensure all Bridgewater College teacher education programs are in compliance with Virginia Board of Education regulations, policies, and procedures. (Refer to Appendix B, pages 46-47, Standard 4, 2a.)
 2. There is a need for faculty with expertise in the area of special education to serve the needs of candidates and to serve as a resource for faculty within the program. (Refer to Appendix B, page 47, Standard 4, 2c.)
- Upon receiving a verbal summary of the weaknesses from the on-site review team on April 30, 2013, during the exit meeting, Bridgewater College officials began implementing a plan to remedy the issues. The following is a summary of the major improvements made by Bridgewater College between the exit report in April 2013 and the review by the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure.
 - ✓ Developed and implemented a formalized Diversity Plan for the Teacher Education Program;
 - ✓ Hired an African-American adjunct professor to team-teach in EDUC 140: Foundations of American Education, ensuring that every teacher education candidate has been taught by a faculty member representing diversity. (A professor of Hispanic background already employed at Bridgewater College teaches literacy courses for candidates seeking PreK-6 and PreK-12 program area endorsements.);
 - ✓ Employed an Education Coordinator, a newly created position, to work with program assessment (i.e., streamlining data accessibility) and field placements--removing these tasks from the Director of Teacher Education's responsibilities;
 - ✓ Initiated a search to hire a new Teacher Education Program faculty member for 2014-2015 with significant life experiences in working with diverse learners;
 - ✓ Created two new courses (SPED 200: Characteristics and Strategies for Working with Individuals with Learning Differences and SPED 210: General Education Teachers and Special Needs Learners) which will be available to teacher candidates in the 2013-2014 academic year; and
 - ✓ Established a video-tutorial project in which area school division directors of special education and student services teach five- to seven-minute tutorials on selected special education topics.
 - At the January 27, 2014, meeting, the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure received the April 2013 *Professional Education Program Review Team Report of Findings*, responses from Bridgewater College, and verification of the work Bridgewater College has completed since April 2013 to address the weaknesses cited by the on-site review team. The following representatives from Bridgewater College were available at the meeting to respond to questions from Advisory Board members: Vice President and Dean for Academic Affairs, Dr. Carol Scheppard; Interim Director, Teacher Education Program and Professor of Education, Dr. Jean Roth Hawk; Professor of Education, Dr. Rebecca Harris; and Coordinator of Teacher Education, Chipley Bader.
 - The following motions were approved by the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure on January 27, 2014:
 1. The Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure respectfully accepts the April 27-30, 2013, *Professional Education Program Review Team Report of Findings*; and

2. The Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure recommends to the Board of Education that (1) the Bridgewater College professional education program be “Accredited,” recognizing the work completed since April 2013 to address weaknesses identified in the *Professional Education Program Review Team Report of Findings* and (2) Bridgewater College provide a status report annually to the Department of Education to monitor the progress of the professional education program.

The Board’s discussion included:

- Mrs. Atkinson expressed appreciation to Bridgewater College for addressing their weaknesses so quickly and correcting them.
- Mrs. Wodiska complimented Bridgewater College on their leadership.

Mrs. Wodiska made a motion to waive first review and approve the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure’s recommendation to accredit the professional education program at Bridgewater College. The motion was seconded by Dr. Baysal and carried unanimously.

First Review of Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) for a Passing Score for the Praxis II Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (5857) Test

Mrs. Patty Pitts presented this item. Mrs. Pitts thanked Dr. Mark Allan, director of teacher licensure, and Mr. Kevin Carrington, Education Testing Service. Mrs. Pitt’s presentation included the following:

- Section 22.1-298.1. *Regulations Governing Licensure of the Code of Virginia* requires that the Board of Education’s regulations “shall include requirements that a person seeking initial licensure: 1. Complete professional assessments as prescribed by the Board of Education...”
- Currently, the Virginia Board of Education requires the following licensure assessments:
 - ✓ Virginia Communication and Literacy Assessment (VCLA)
 - ✓ Praxis II: Specialty Area Tests
 - ✓ Reading for Virginia Educators (RVE)
 - ✓ School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA)
- The Board of Education prescribes the Praxis II (subject area content) tests as a professional teacher’s assessment requirement for initial licensure in Virginia. The Praxis II test currently required for individuals seeking an initial license with an endorsement in Health and Physical Education preK-12 is the Praxis II Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (0856/5856) test. A Praxis II test for this endorsement has been required in Virginia since July 1, 1999.
- The Educational Testing Service (ETS) that administers the Praxis II has developed the revised Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (5857) test. The purpose of the test is to assess whether the entry-level health and physical education teacher has the content knowledge and skills believed necessary for competent practice. Test preparation resources and materials, including study guides and practice tests, are available on the [ETS Test Preparation Web site](#).
- A multistate standard setting study was conducted by ETS in November 2013 for the Praxis II Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (5857) test. Participants from 11 states, Washington, D. C., and Guam served on the multistate study panel. Virginia was represented by two Virginia educators who were nominated by Virginia educational agencies. A detailed summary of the study, *Multistate Standard Setting Technical Report – Praxis II Health and Physical Education (5857)*, is attached (Appendix A) and includes participants, methodology, and recommendations. The purposes of the study were to (a) recommend the minimum passing score for the Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (5857) and (b) confirm the importance of the Praxis content specifications for entry-level health and physical education teachers. To pass the Health and Physical Education:

Content Knowledge (5857) test, a candidate must meet or exceed the passing score established by the Virginia Board of Education.

- The *Praxis Test at a Glance* document (Appendix B) describes the purpose and structure of the assessment. In brief, the purpose of the test is to assess whether the entry-level health and physical education teacher has the content knowledge and skills believed necessary for competent practice. Two National Advisory Committees of Health and Physical Education teachers and college faculty defined the content of the assessment, and national surveys of teachers and college faculty confirmed the content.
- The Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (5857) test contains 130 selected-response items covering five content areas: Health Education as a Discipline/Health Instruction (approximately 26 items); Health Education Content (approximately 32 items); Content Knowledge and Student Growth and Development (approximately 22 items); Management, Motivation, and Communication/Collaboration, Reflection, and Technology (approximately 29 items); and Planning, Instruction, and Student Assessment (approximately 21 items). The reporting scale for the Praxis II Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (5857) test ranges from 100 to 200 scaled-score points.

Multistate Standard Setting Study

The multistate standard-setting study is detailed in Appendix B. The multistate panel recommended a passing score of 74 out of a possible 110 raw-score points. The scaled score associated with a raw score of 74 is 160 on a 100 to 200 scale.

The multistate standard study provides the estimated conditional standard error or measurement (CSEM). The CSEM is a statistical phenomenon and is unrelated to the accuracy of scoring. All test results are subject to the standard error of measurement. If a test taker were to take the same test repeatedly, with no change in his level of knowledge and preparation, it is possible that some of the resulting scores would be slightly higher or slightly lower than the scores that precisely reflects the test taker's actual level of knowledge or ability. The difference between a test taker's actual score and his highest or lowest hypothetical score is known as the standard error of measurement.

The CSEM for the recommended passing scores for multistate standard-setting study are shown in the chart below. Note that consistent with the recommended passing score, the passing scores at the different CSEMs have been rounded to the next highest number, and the rounded values are converted to scaled scores.

Conditional Standard Error of Measurement Summaries Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (5857)

Passing Scores Within 1 and 2 CSEMs of the Recommended Passing Score – Multistate Panel

	Recommended passing score (CSEM)	Scale score equivalent
	74 (4.94)	160
- 2 CSEMs	65	149
-1 CSEM	70	155
+1 CSEM	79	167
+ 2 CSEMs	84	173

- At the January 27, 2014, meeting of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure the Advisory Board recommended that the Virginia Board of Education approve a pass score of 160 (74 raw-score points) recommended by the multistate standard setting panel for the Praxis II Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (5857) test.

The Board's discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears noted that the Praxis II test for the endorsement for Health and Physical Education has been required since July 1, 1999, and asked if other endorsements had this long of a date. Mrs. Pitts said there are other tests that predate 1999. Mrs. Pitts said that in

1981 the testing requirement was implemented using ETS.

- Mrs. Pitts also said physical education and health were separate endorsements until 1999 when the tests were combined. Mrs. Sears noted that the purpose of the tests is to assess whether the entry-level health and physical education teacher has the content knowledge and skills believed necessary for competent practice.

The Board accepted for first review the Advisory Board of Teacher Education and Licensure's recommendation that the Virginia Board of Education approve a pass score of 160 (74 raw-score points) for the Praxis II Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (5857) test.

First Review of Proposed Revised Foreign Language Standards of Learning

Dr. Lisa Harris, specialist for Foreign Language, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- The *Code of Virginia* requires a review of Virginia's Standards of Learning every seven years.

Code of Virginia 22.1-253.13:1-2 The Board of Education shall establish a regular schedule, in a manner it deems appropriate, for the review and revision as may be necessary of the Standards of Learning in all subject areas. Such review of each subject area shall occur at least once every seven years. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Board from conducting such review and revision on a more frequent basis.

- The *Foreign Language Standards of Learning* were adopted by the Board of Education on February 28, 2007. The current standards may be viewed online at http://www.doe.virginia.gov/testing/sol/standards_docs/foreign_language/index.shtml.
- On February 27, 2013, the Board of Education approved the timeline for reviewing the current standards. Upon approval of the timetable, the following actions occurred:
 - ✓ Received public comment on the 2007 *Foreign Language Standards of Learning*;
 - ✓ Identified French, German, Latin, Spanish, and Modern Foreign Language Standards of Learning Revision team members;
 - ✓ Met for three days on July 30 – August 1, 2013 with the five foreign language review teams that consisted of recommended individuals solicited from school divisions, to review the public comments and to consider recommendations and reports from stakeholder groups; and
 - ✓ Developed a draft of the proposed revised *Foreign Language Standards of Learning*.
- A wide variety of constituents have been consulted regarding the revisions to the 2007 *Foreign Language Standards of Learning*. The various concerns and priorities of those constituents have been incorporated whenever possible within the proposed draft of the *Foreign Language Standards of Learning*.
- During the Department's public comment period on the 2007 *Foreign Language Standards of Learning*, 49 comments were received electronically. No comments were received via U.S. Mail. Of this total, 34 were unique comments submitted in one of the five language categories and 15 were the same three comments submitted to all five categories. Examples of the recommendations include: a name change from Foreign Languages to World Languages; the addition of standards for character-based and non-Roman alphabet languages; and structural changes to clarify the intent of the SOL.
- The number of comments received is listed by language group below:

French	10
German	9
Spanish	14
Latin	3
Modern Foreign Language	13
Total Comments	49

- All comments were carefully considered and suggestions were incorporated into the draft standards as appropriate.
- The major elements of the attached proposed revised *Foreign Language Standards of Learning* include:
 - ✓ Edits to enhance clarity, specificity, and alignment of skills and content;
 - ✓ Edits to reflect performance expectations that are sequential and developmental;
 - ✓ Edits to the organizing strand titles to reflect current academic research and practice; and
 - ✓ Addition of generic standards for non-western languages to address the language acquisition process for character-based and non-Roman alphabet languages.
- The review committees also made recommendations to the Department for the development of technical assistance documents to address other concerns raised by the field and to supplement the *Foreign Language Standards of Learning*.

The Board's discussion included:

- Mr. Braunlich asked if the Department knows how many high schools teach particular foreign languages. Dr. Harris said the Department can collect that data but she does not have the information currently.
- Dr. Cannaday asked the rationale for continuing to call languages foreign versus other languages. Dr. Harris said thirty-one states now use the term world language instead of foreign language and Virginia is one of eleven states still using foreign language. Dr. Harris said the recommendation from the committee is to start using world language versus foreign language. Dr. Harris said foreign language is referred to in the *Code* for graduation requirements and also referred to in some funding initiatives.
- Mr. Braunlich asked if nonwestern world languages standards are taught through Virtual Virginia. Dr. Harris said Chinese and Arabic courses are taught on Virtual Virginia.
- Dr. Wright said the technical change to use world language versus foreign language can be recommended through the review of the Standards of Quality.
- Dr. Wright thanked Dr. Harris for her work on the proposed revisions to the *Foreign Language Standards of Learning*. Dr. Wright also recognized Dr. Linda Wallinger, former assistant superintendent for instruction at the Department of Education, for her work on the standards. Mr. Braunlich thanked Dr. Wallinger for her service on behalf of the Board.
- Dr. Baysal thanked Dr. Cannaday for his suggestion of using world languages versus foreign language. Dr. Baysal also suggested looking at the use of nonwestern languages.
- Mr. Ko asked which schools teach Korean language. Dr. Harris did not have that information, but indicated she would follow up.

The Board accepted for first review the proposed revisions to the *Foreign Language Standards of Learning*.

First Review of Virginia's Application for a One-Year Extension of Waivers from Certain Requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)

Mrs. Veronica Tate, director, office of program administration and accountability, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- In September 2011, the U.S. Department of Education (USED) offered states flexibility regarding specific requirements of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA), as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), in exchange for rigorous and comprehensive state-developed plans designed to

improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve the quality of instruction (ESEA flexibility). To be granted flexibility from ESEA requirements, states had to submit applications requesting waivers and outlining the state-developed plans to accomplish the goals above by implementing reforms aligned with the following principles:

- ✓ Principle 1 – College- and career-ready standards and high-quality assessments to ensure that every student graduates from high school college and career ready;
 - ✓ Principle 2 – Targeted and differentiated accountability systems, rigorous supports and interventions to the lowest-performing schools and schools with the lowest graduation rates, and identification of support to low-achieving students based on need; and
 - ✓ Principle 3 – Teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that provide teachers and principals with the feedback and support needed to improve practice and increase student achievement.
- Virginia submitted its waiver request to USED in February 2012, or “Window 2” of the submission process. After numerous amendments, the [final revised ESEA flexibility application](#) was approved in March 2013. The terms of the waiver are effective for two years, through the end of the 2013-2014 school year.
 - In November 2013, USED issued a letter to state superintendents inviting “Window 1” and “Window 2” states to request a one-year extension of ESEA flexibility through the end of the 2014-2015 school year. A state seeking an extension of ESEA flexibility must: 1) submit a letter to USED requesting an extension of ESEA flexibility and describing how the flexibility has been effective in enabling the state to carry out the activities for which the flexibility was requested and how the flexibility has contributed to improved student achievement; and 2) resolve any state-specific issues and or action items identified as a result of USED’s Part B monitoring of ESEA flexibility, including by submitting, as necessary and where applicable, a revised application. A state may also submit additional amendment requests through a revised application.
 - States must submit ESEA flexibility extension requests by February 28, 2014, or within 60 days of receipt of the ESEA flexibility Part B monitoring report. On September 30, 2014, USED conducted Part B monitoring of the state’s implementation of ESEA flexibility provisions. Virginia has not yet received an official monitoring report from USED.
 - Virginia will request the one-year extension for ESEA flexibility. As part of the request, the state will include a summary of a proposed amendment to its ESEA flexibility plan and a complete redline version of its ESEA flexibility application with updates to Principles 1 and 3 and proposed amendment to Principle 2. The Department of Education has developed the proposed application for a one-year extension to its ESEA flexibility request based on guidance received to date. The Department will present the application to the Board for final review after the monitoring report is received.

Principle 1 – College- and Career-Ready Standards and High-Quality Assessments (Update)

Implementation of College- and Career-Ready Standards

Virginia has fully implemented its college- and career-ready Standards of Learning and assessments in reading and mathematics as described in its original waiver request. Unlike states that have adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to replace their prior standards, Virginia’s college- and career-ready Standards of Learning are an extension of earlier Standards of Learning that have been enhanced to ensure students are prepared for successful entry into postsecondary education and the workplace.

As anticipated, the implementation of new rigorous assessments reflecting the revised standards resulted in declines in pass rates on assessment administered for mathematics in 2011-2012 and reading in 2012-2013. In response, the Virginia Department of Education has provided extensive professional development, instructional resources, and technical assistance to schools and school divisions. Highlights of those efforts include:

- Creating an information Web site, TeacherDirect, which provides updates on professional development opportunities to teachers and other classroom personnel. Over 23,000 educators are currently subscribed to a weekly e-mail containing these updates.
- Providing increased assistance to educators of English language learners (ELLs), including developing policy recommendations, providing extensive professional development trainings and resources on instructional

strategies that align with the 2012 amplified English language development standards, and enhancing the Department's Web site for ELL-related policy and support.

- Providing increased assistance to educators of students with disabilities, including partnering with Virginia Commonwealth University to establish a statewide center for development, dissemination, and evaluation of effective practices for students with disabilities, and developing the Virginia Tiered System of Supports as a systemic framework for providing resources and support for academic and behavioral success.
- Ensuring, through the federal program application and monitoring process, alignment of Title II, Part A, funds with the results of local needs assessments conducted in collaboration with the divisions' teachers and principals. The process also ensures funds are used for evidence-based professional development efforts that deepen educators' subject-matter knowledge of instructional practices for all students and subgroups.

In addition to the Department's enhanced efforts to assist schools and school divisions in implementing revised standards, the General Assembly has funded a number of initiatives to recruit and maintain effective teachers in Virginia's classrooms by contributing to their initial teacher preparation or ongoing professional development. Examples include incentive awards, strategic compensation grants, and scholarship loan programs, and the establishment of the Virginia Center for Excellence in Teaching which will provide professional development for 100 teachers annually.

Implementation of College- and Career-Ready Assessments

The administration of the state assessments in an online format has provided Virginia with the opportunity to develop next-generation assessments that include technology-enhanced items in addition to multiple-choice items. The technology-enhanced items provide for different ways to measure critical thinking and problem-solving skills and support the increased rigor inherent in Virginia's new content standards. New Standards of Learning mathematics tests for grades 3-8, Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II that include technology-enhanced items were administered for the first time in 2011-2012. New reading, writing, and science assessments that also include technology-enhanced items were implemented in 2012-2013. The Algebra II, Reading, and Writing end-of-course Standards of Learning tests include a "college path" achievement level that represents the prerequisite skills and knowledge that students need for success in introductory credit-bearing college courses.

Principle 2 – Targeted and Differentiated Accountability Systems (Amendment)

Annual Measurable Objectives

At its October 2012 meeting, the Virginia Board of Education approved and USED accepted a revised annual measurable objective (AMO) methodology applied to a six-year trajectory. The methodology requires lower-performing subgroups to make greater gains in pass rates to close the achievement gap in reading and mathematics. The Board also established new continuous progress expectations for higher-performing subgroups. The policy requires that subgroups with a prior year pass rate higher than the current year's target maintain or exceed the prior year pass rate, within five percent, and up to 90 percent. Also, subgroups with a starting pass rate higher than the required Year 6 pass rate are expected to make continuous progress. Schools with subgroups that do not meet the higher expectations currently receive an accountability status of *Did Not Meet All Federal AMOs – MHE (did not Meet Higher Expectations)*.

The higher expectations were established in an effort to ensure higher-performing subgroups continue to advance their achievement. However, impact data analyzed in fall of 2013 indicate that a disproportionate percentage of schools are adversely affected by one or more subgroups not meeting the higher expectations. As well, the minimum group size reduction from 50 to 30 students in the 2012-2013 assessment year further magnified the impact of the higher expectations because more schools were accountable for the now smaller subgroups that had previously not been reported for federal accountability. Fluctuations in the number of students in a subgroup from year to year also create inconsistencies when comparing a high pass rate in the prior year to the current year's achievement of a different cohort of students. Hence, the Board's policy, which has been coined the "no backsliding" policy, created unintended consequences during 2012-2013 where high-performing subgroups did not meet the AMOs, thus the school did not meet the required federal accountability benchmarks.

To mitigate the unintended consequences of the higher expectations embedded among the provisions to meet AMOs, the Department of Education proposes that these higher expectations be used as an incentive for schools and subgroups. Beginning with the 2014-2015 accountability year (2013-2014 assessment year), a subgroup would be considered as meeting the federal AMOs for reading and mathematics if:

1. The subgroup's current year pass rate meets or exceeds the target;
2. The subgroup's three year average meets or exceeds the target; or
3. The subgroup reduces the failure rate by 10 percent as compared to the prior year (safe harbor).

The Department proposes that schools with all subgroups meeting the AMOs by the aforementioned provisions, and have one or more subgroups meeting the higher expectations approved by the Board in October 2012, would receive a status of *Met All Federal AMOs and Higher Expectations*. The *Did Not Meet All Federal AMOs – MHE* (*did not Meet Higher Expectations*) status would be discontinued.

Reward Schools Criteria

Criteria for the identification of Blue Ribbon and Title I Distinguished Schools and School Divisions have been modified to more closely align with reading and mathematics AMO expectations and federal graduation indicator (FGI) requirements. As well, the revised criteria for Blue Ribbon Achievement Gap Schools and Title I Highly Distinguished Schools and School Divisions include more rigorous requirements for reading and mathematics performance and the FGI for all students and *each* subgroup.

Principle 3 – Teacher and Principal Evaluation Systems (Update)

Guidelines for Local Teacher and Principal Evaluation and Support Systems

Virginia has fully implemented model teacher and principal evaluation systems approved by the Virginia Board of Education. Extensive technical assistance and professional development have been provided to central office leaders, principals, and teachers in the implementation of the Board's approved teacher and principal model evaluation systems. For example, technical assistance trainings were provided throughout the state, various evaluation resources were posted to the Department's Web site, and the Support Dialogue and Performance Improvement Plan were developed as tools for use by an evaluator in addressing professional performance.

Guidelines for Superintendent Evaluation and Support

Although not a requirement for ESEA flexibility, the Department convened a work group in Spring 2012 to conduct a comprehensive study of superintendent evaluation. At its September 27, 2012, meeting, the Board of Education approved the revised document, *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Superintendents*, which reflected recommendations from the workgroup. The guidelines become effective on July 1, 2014; however, school boards and divisions may implement them prior to that date.

General Assembly Legislation

The 2013 General Assembly passed legislation to revise teacher, principal, and superintendent evaluation. Among the revisions are the following:

- Required annual evaluations, either formal or informal, for teachers and administrators.
- Professional development for school board members, including, but not limited to, personnel evaluation.
- A change in the deadline for a school board to notify principals, assistant principals, or supervisors under continuing contract status of their reassignment to teaching positions from April 15 to June 15.
- Flexibility for school boards to increase the term of probationary service required before a teacher becomes eligible for continuing contract from three years up to five years.

Required Reporting on Teacher and Principal Evaluation

In 2012, Virginia modified its Teacher and Principal Evaluation Collection Survey (TPEC-Survey) system to align with provisions of the state's approved ESEA flexibility application. The modified collection includes certain certifications regarding local evaluation implementation, such as student academic progress accounting for a total of 40 percent of the summative evaluation for teachers, for which all divisions have reported compliance. As required by the School Improvement Grant (SIG) program under Section 1003(g) of ESEA, the Department collected and reviewed extensive teacher evaluation data from schools receiving these funds, including rating levels and definitions, as well as the number of teachers rated at each level for each of the domains (performance standards) or summative levels.

The Board of accepted for first review Virginia's ESEA flexibility extension application.

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES

Mrs. Wodiska spoke about her visit to Petersburg City Public Schools and commended them on improvements made in their schools. Mrs. Wodiska particularly noted Petersburg's school lunch program and early childhood education programs.

The Board met for a public dinner on Wednesday, February 26, 2014, at the Commonwealth Park Suites Hotel with the following members present: Mrs. Atkinson, Dr. Baysal, Mr. Braunlich, Dr. Cannaday, Mrs. Edwards, Mr. Ko, Mrs. Sears, and Mrs. Wodiska. Dr. Patricia Wright, Superintendent of Public Instruction, also attended the meeting. Members discussed pending Board agenda items. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 8:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mrs. Sears made a motion to go into executive session under *Virginia Code* §2.2-3711(A)(41), to convene in a closed meeting for the purpose of discussion and consideration of records relating to denial, suspension, or revocation of teacher licenses, and that Noelle Shaw-Bell, legal counsel to the Virginia Board of Education, and Wendell Roberts, as well as staff members, Patricia Wright, Patty Pitts, Nancy Walsh, and Richard Schley, participate in this closed meeting. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously. The Board went into Executive Session at 12:40 p.m.

Mrs. Sears made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously. The Board reconvened at 1:40 p.m.

Mrs. Sears made a motion that the Board certify by roll-call vote that to the best of each member's knowledge, (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements of the Freedom of Information Act were discussed and (2) only matters identified in the motion to have the closed session were discussed. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wodiska and carried unanimously.

Board Roll call:

Dr. Baysal – Yes
Mrs. Edwards – Yes
Mrs. Sears – Yes
Mr. Braunlich – Yes

Dr. Cannaday – Yes
Mrs. Atkinson – Yes
Mrs. Wodiska – Yes
Mr. Ko – Yes

The Board made the following motions:

- Mr. Braunlich made a motion to revoke the license of Bobby W. Brown. The motion was seconded by Dr. Baysal and carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE BUSINESS SESSION

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Career and Technical Education, Mr. Braunlich adjourned the meeting at 1:41 p.m.

President